UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,423	01/21/2004	Shigeo Fujii	T3201.0041	1238
32172 DICKSTEIN S	7590 11/14/200 HAPIRO LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS (6TH AVENUE)			SMITH, CREIGHTON H	
NEW YORK,	NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
		,		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
·			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	1						
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/760,423	FUJII, SHIGEO				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Creighton H. Smith	2614				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	(IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MO	NTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a repl vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. ly be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_·					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-76</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-76</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
·—	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).				
,.	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not re	eceived.				
		,					
Attachmen	t(s)	•					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.							
3) 🛛 Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 01.25.06, 6.30.06, 7.19.07.		ormal Patent Application				

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In short, examiner is having a very difficult time trying to ascertain what the invention entails, because the application is a direct translation into English and therefore lacks correct idiomatic English. Examiner is not sure who is calling who. Do both of the counterpart terminals, wireless terminals 41 & 42, belong to the user of PC-2, such that if a call comes into PC-2 it will forwarded to either of terminals 41/42?? About all that examiner can ascertain from the drawings and the non-grammatical spec is that a PC using VoIP is calling a wireless unit outside of a PBX.

A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

Claims 1-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2614

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

The claims should be completely re-written in idiomatic English.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-76 as understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(E) as being anticipated by Turcan et al, U.S. Patent Publication #2004/0125937.

Turcan et al show in Fig. 8 a PBX (208) – the controller, PCs (100) – the information processors, and mobile phones (202 & 816), similar to applicant's Fig. 6.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Creighton H.

Smith at telephone number 571/272-7546.

07 NOV '07

Creighton H Smith **Primary Examiner**

Page 3

Art Unit 2614